

Riley County Vision 2025 Committee Meeting

May 10, 2007

7:30 – 9:30 p.m. Denison Fire Station

Meeting Summary

Welcome & Introductions

- The meeting was called to order at 7:30p by co-facilitator, Terrie McCants.
- The general public was acknowledged and asked to participate by writing comments/input on cards provided.
- Monty Wedel included an update on the moratorium discussions being held by the Board of County Commissioners and stated that the next meeting to discuss the topic was scheduled for May 24, 2007 at 10:20am.

Idea for Public Forum

- Monty Wedel discussed options for committee to consider, such as bringing in a private consultant (Clarion & Assoc.) for an implementation strategies workshop.
- Discussed the Regional Growth Plan (EDAW) and encouraged the committee to attend the Manhattan meeting. He stated that there could be considerable overlap in that Plan and the Riley County Comp. Plan update.
- Mr. Wedel discussed the idea of bringing in Professor Eric Bernard to discuss the potential to set up a LESA system and how it was used for the recently adopted Dickinson County Comprehensive Plan.
- Mr. Wedel discussed the suggestion of polling all Kansas counties to see what strategies they have in place to preserve agricultural areas; then, set up a panel consisting of various County officials, staff or citizens within a public forum to get feedback and information.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the group to (1) acquire the information from what other counties are doing and what E. Bernard has with the LESA analysis in Dickinson County; (2) encourage all members of the Vision 2025 Committee to attend the regional growth plan meeting scheduled for May 23 – details handed out; and (3) reserve both the Clarion & Associates and other county representatives, including Bernard's presentation, as resources for future public meetings where the public input and contributions to the process will be asked for and considered.

Agriculture – Goals, Rationales, & Policies

Report from Subcommittee meetings

Monty Wedel presented a summary of the work done to date. The summary comments are attached for reference.

Continuation of Planning Goals

Residential

- The Committee reviewed each of the proposed/revised Objective and Policy statements. All were approved with the following exceptions:
- Residential:
 1. Suggestion was to include a new Objective statement regarding single family residential development.
 2. Policy R1.4, R2.2, R3.2, and R3.4 were tabled for subcommittee revision.

The Way Forward

- Next Subcommittee meeting to be May 24th 7:30-9:30pm.
- Next Full Vision 2025 Committee to be June 21st 7:30-9:30pm @ TBA

Adjourned

AGRICULTURE SUBGROUP SUMMARY

April 26, 2007

Members Present: Diane Hoobler, Jon Howe, Nathan Larson, Jan Lyons, Joe Mertz, Linda Morse, Mark Scott, John Strickler, Vinton Visser, Ralph Wahl,

Staff Present: Monty Wedel

Major Themes/Observations/Suggestions

- Preservation of agricultural lands/areas is important
- The protection of existing agricultural operations from encroachment by incompatible uses is important
- It is also important to preserve some ability by agricultural land-owners to access the value in their lands for retirement, etc.
- Ideally, the ability to access the land value by the individual land-owner must be balanced in some way with the goal of preserving agricultural areas for present and future societal needs as well as to protect the rights of existing agricultural producers who desire to preserve their present and future investment in continuing the use of the land for agricultural production
- The implementation strategy we use to accomplish this should be simple and easy for the public and land-owners to understand
- Part of the implementation strategy should be to promote the use of conservation easement (purchase of development rights) opportunities where available, realizing there are limits based on funding and program eligibility
- Part of the implementation strategy should be to require that all non-agricultural uses in the agricultural areas sign an affidavit acknowledging the location as an agricultural area and a commitment not to make a nuisance claim against agricultural uses in the future.
- Part of the implementation strategy could be to allow homes on existing 20 acre tracts to be split off with a smaller lot (2-5 acres) and the remainder returned to agriculture or increased in residential density, if appropriate

- At some level of density, it is appropriate that the Riley County Planning Board and the Board of County Commissioners review a development proposal to ensure compatible use and adequate infrastructure for public health, safety and welfare
- One suggestion was that one non-agricultural residence per one-quarter section (160 acres) is an appropriate density level at which to initiate review (i.e. 1 non-ag residence per 160 would be the level of unplanned and unregulated growth)
- At the very least, our zoning strategy should be changed from a minimum 20-acre lot size requirement, to a one-lot per 20 acre requirement, with the lot minimum being dictated by sanitary code

AGRICULTURE SUBGROUP SUMMARY

May 3, 2007

Members Present: Diane Hoobler, Jon Howe, Tom Link, Jan Lyons, Joe Mertz, Linda Morse, Mark Scott, Vinton Visser, Ralph Wahl,

Staff Present: Bob Isaac, Monty Wedel

Points of Agreement

- **Preservation of agricultural lands/areas is important**
- **The protection of existing agricultural operations from encroachment by incompatible uses is important**
(Subject to definition of incompatible uses)
- **The implementation strategy used should be simple and easy for the public and land-owners to understand**
- **Part of the implementation strategy should be to promote the use of conservation easement (purchase of development rights) opportunities where available, realizing there are limits based on funding and program eligibility**
- **Part of the implementation strategy should be to require that all non-agricultural uses in the agricultural areas sign an affidavit acknowledging the location as an agricultural area and a commitment not to make a nuisance claim against agricultural uses in the future (It was agreed that an affidavit similar to one developed for the moratorium, a draft of which is attached for reference, could be used but would need re-wording)**
- **Part of the implementation strategy could be to allow homes on existing 20 acre tracts to be split off with a smaller lot (2-5 acres) and the remainder returned to agriculture or increased in residential density, if appropriate (This was agreed upon in principle, realizing many details are yet to be worked out)**
- **At some level of density, it is appropriate that the Riley County Planning Board and the Board of County Commissioners review a development proposal to ensure compatible use and adequate infrastructure for public health, safety and welfare**

Points Not Yet Agreed Upon

- At the very least, our zoning strategy should be changed from a minimum 20-acre lot size requirement, to a one-lot per 20 acre requirement, with the lot minimum being dictated by sanitary code **(no consensus, confusion as to the ramifications of such a change)**
- It is also important to preserve some ability by agricultural land-owners to access the value in their lands for retirement, etc. **(no consensus)**
- Ideally, the ability to access the land value by the individual land-owner must be balanced in some way with the goal of preserving agricultural areas for present and future societal needs as well as to protect the rights of existing agricultural producers who desire to preserve their present and future investment in continuing the use of the land for agricultural production **(needs work)**
- What density level should required review begin?
- What criteria should be used to decide upon requests presented to the Boards?